Appendix C

Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Records of Decision

Appendix C

Records of Decision

Table C.1. Summary of WM-PEIS Decisions Relevant to the HSW EIS

	Federal	
Duamaged Action	Register Citation	DOE Decision
Proposed Action		
TRU Disposal at	63 FR 3624,	DOE will dispose of up to 175,600 cubic meters of TRU waste
WIPP	Jan. 23 1998	(except PCB commingled TRU waste) at WIPP. Transportation of
		waste to WIPP will initially be by truck, but DOE reserved the
		option to use commercial rail transportation in the future. The
		wastes include both CH and RH TRU waste placed in retrievable
		storage after 1970, and TRU waste generated for approximately
		the next 35 years by plutonium stabilization and management
		activities, environmental restoration (including defense TRU waste
		from future remediation of sites where TRU waste was buried
		before 1970), decontamination and decommissioning, waste
		management, and defense testing and research.
TRU	63 FR 3629,	DOE will develop and operate mobile and fixed facilities to
Characterization	Jan. 23 1998	characterize and prepare TRU waste for disposal at WIPP. Each of
and Preparation		the DOE sites that has, or will generate, TRU waste will, as
for Disposal		needed, prepare and store its TRU waste on site, except that the
		SNL-NM will transfer its TRU waste to LANL in New Mexico.
		LANL will have facilities, not available or anticipated at SNL-NM,
		to prepare and store this waste prior to disposal.
Hazardous Waste	63 FR 41810,	DOE decided to continue to use off-site facilities for the treatment
Treatment	Aug. 5 1998	of major portions of the hazardous waste generated at DOE sites.
		Oak Ridge and Savannah River will treat some of their own
		hazardous waste on-site, where capacity is available in existing
		facilities and where this is economically favorable. This decision
		does not involve any transfers of hazardous waste among DOE
		sites. The potential health and environmental impacts of this
		decision were identified in the Decentralized Alternative analyzed
		in the WM PEIS.

Table C.1. (contd)

	Federal	
Proposed	Register	
Action	Citation	DOE Decision
HLW Interim	64 FR 46661	DOE selected the Decentralized Alternative, to store immobilized
Storage		HLW in a final form at the site of generation (Hanford, INEEL,
		SRS, or WVDP) until transfer to a geologic repository. This
		decision is the same as the WM PEIS preferred alternative.
LLW Treatment	65 FR 10061,	The DOE decided that each site will perform minimum treatment
	Feb 25, 2000	on its LLW, although each site may perform additional treatment
		as would be useful to decrease overall costs. This decision did not
		preclude DOE' use of commercial treatment facilities.
Disposal of LLW	65 FR 10061,	The DOE decided to establish regional LLW disposal at Hanford
	Feb 25, 2000	Site and NTS. Hanford Site and NTS are to dispose of their own
		LLW on-site, and are to receive and dispose of LLW that is
		generated and shipped by other DOE sites.
MLLW	65 FR 10061,	DOE decided to conduct regional MLLW treatment at Hanford
Treatment	Feb 25, 2000	and other DOE sites consistent with their hazardous waste site
		treatment plans. This decision does not preclude use of
Marana, 1	65 ED 10061	commercial treatment facilities.
MLLW Disposal	65 FR 10061,	The DOE decided to establish regional MLLW disposal operations
	Feb 25, 2000	at Hanford and NTS. Hanford and NTS will each dispose of their
		own MLLW on-site, and will receive and dispose of MLLW
Centralized TRU	(5 FD 92095	generated by other DOE sites.
	65 FR 82985,	DOE revised its earlier ROD to create a centralized capability at
Characterization Capability at	Dec. 29, 2000	WIPP to characterize for disposal up to 1,250 cubic meters of CH-TRU out of about 7,000 cubic meters expected to be received
WIPP		annually at WIPP for disposal. In addition, the time that CH-TRU
VV 11 1		waste may be stored above ground will be increased from 60 days
		to one year and the total above-ground storage capacity will be
		increased by 25 percent, for a maximum storage capacity of
		152 cubic meters. The disposal characterization capability at
		WIPP would have the ability to characterize approximately 4,000
		to 6,000 drum volume equivalents (830 to 1,250 cubic meters) of
		waste annually. Also, no remote-handled TRU waste will be
		characterized at WIPP.
Transfer of CH-	66 FR 38646,	DOE has decided to transfer approximately 300 cubic meters of
TRU from	Dec. 29, 2000	CH-TRU waste (having a total of approximately 1,000 curies)
Mound to SRS		from the Mound Plant to SRS for storage, characterization, and
		repackaging for disposal at WIPP. DOE will ship this Mound CH-
		TRU waste to SRS in OHOX railcars (formerly known as ATMX
		railcars), in accordance with a DOT exemption from the
		requirement for shipping this waste in a Type B container. DOE
		will make up to ten shipments, each with one OHOX railcar
		loaded with no more than 200 curies of TRU waste.

Table C.1. (contd)

	Federal	
Proposed	Register	
Action	Citation	DOE Decision
TRU Shipment	67 FR 56989,	Battelle West Jefferson North Site - DOE decided to transfer
to Hanford from	Sept. 6, 2002	approximately 27 cubic meters (approximately 125 55-gallon
Ohio		drums) of contact- and remote-handled TRU waste from the West
		Jefferson site to the DOE Hanford Site for storage prior to disposal
		at WIPP. Approximately 15 truck shipments will be required to
		transfer the inventory of packaged TRU waste to Hanford. The
		shipments are expected to commence in summer of 2002 and to be
		completed within 12 months.
TRU Shipment	67 FR 56989,	Energy Technology Engineering Center - DOE decided to transfer
to Hanford from	Sept. 6, 2002	up to 9 cubic meters of TRU waste (26 to 45 55-gallon drums), of
California		which most of the remote-handled TRU waste has a low
		(approximately 130 parts per million) concentration of PCB
		contaminant, from ETEC to the DOE Hanford Site for storage
		prior to planned disposal at WIPP. Up to five casks will be
		required to transfer the inventory of packaged TRU waste to the
		receiving site in 1 to 5 shipments, depending on the volume of
		ETEC waste that can be placed in each cask and the number of
		casks that can be transported per shipment. DOE intends to
		complete the shipments over a 12-month period.